

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

HILDA ORTEGA,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF SOCIAL
SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,

Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

CASE NO. 1:13-CV-02080

OPINION & ORDER
[Resolving Docs. [1](#) & [17](#)]

JAMES S. GWIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE:

On June 11, 2014, Magistrate Judge Vernelis K. Armstrong recommended that the Court affirm the Commissioner of Social Security's denial of supplemental security income^{1/} to Plaintiff Hilda Ortega.^{2/} Plaintiff Ortega has not filed an objection to the Report and Recommendation. The Court **ADOPTS** the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation and **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's decision.

The Federal Magistrates Act requires a district court to conduct a *de novo* review only of those portions of a Report and Recommendation to which the parties have made an objection.^{3/} Parties must file any objections to a Report and Recommendation within fourteen days of service.^{4/} Failure to object within that time waives a party's right to appeal the Magistrate Judge's

^{1/}Plaintiff Ortega originally sought disability insurance benefits as well, but she withdrew that request before the administrative law judge. *See* Doc. [15](#) at 1-2.

^{2/}Doc. [17](#).

^{3/}[28 U.S.C. § 636\(b\)\(1\)](#).

^{4/}[N.D. Ohio L.R. 72.3\(b\)](#).

Case No. 1:13-CV-02080
Gwin, J.

recommendation.^{5/} Absent objection, a district court may adopt the Magistrate Judge's report without review.^{6/} Moreover, having conducted its own review of the complaint^{7/} and briefing,^{8/} this Court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate Judge.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** in whole Magistrate Judge Armstrong's findings of fact and conclusions of law and incorporates them fully herein by reference. The Court **AFFIRMS** the Commissioner's denial of supplemental security income.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 3, 2014

s/ *James S. Gwin*
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

^{5/}*Id.*; see [Thomas v. Arn](#), 474 U.S. 140, 145 (1985); [United States v. Walters](#), 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

^{6/}[Thomas](#), 474 U.S. at 149.

^{7/}Doc. [1](#).

^{8/}Doc. [15](#) (Plaintiff's brief); Doc. [16](#) (Commissioner's brief).